

20000204.ba v02\_n797.bam.20000204

>From ???@??? Fri Feb 4 14:48:07 2000 -0600  
Date: Fri, 4 Feb 2000 14:45:55 CST  
From: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
Subject: BOATANCHORS digest 2797  
Message-Id: <20000204204913.8CA7D274C3@devel143.theporch.com>

BOATANCHORS Digest 2797

Topics covered in this issue include:

- 1) Re: PILOT WASP  
by "Mike O'Brien" <mobrien@lib.drury.edu>
- 2) Re pilot wasp  
by philip mccooy <dgnova@erols.com>
- 3) voltages, again (long)  
by "Paul Bernhard Sr." <w2tu@email.msn.com>
- 4) Re: 3 questions  
by David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
- 5) Re: 3 questions  
by William Donzelli <aw288@osfn.org>
- 6) FS: 2ea Pair of 4-250A Eimac and RCA Tubes  
by sbrovas <sbrovas@tir.com>
- 7) FS: Pair of EIMAC 100TH Tubes  
by sbrovas <sbrovas@tir.com>
- 8) FS: Collins and Blackhawk Passband Filters  
by sbrovas <sbrovas@tir.com>
- 9) Re: Re pilot wasp  
by "John Dilks, K2TQN" <oldradio@worldnet.att.net>
- 10) R-390A help!  
by Walt Petersen <w2jdh@hitter.net>
- 11) Re: R-390A help!  
by "Mike Feher" <n4fs@monmouth.com>
- 12) Re: R-390A help!  
by "Mike Feher" <n4fs@monmouth.com>
- 13) Re: Wasp  
by Jderm740@aol.com
- 14) r-390a  
by "Larry L. Ravlin" <sheepdip@continet.com>
- 15) Re: R-390A help!  
by "A. B. Bonds" <ab@vuse.vanderbilt.edu>
- 16) FILTER CAPS IN SERIES  
by JOHN\_SEHRING.parti@ecunet.org (JOHN SEHRING)
- 17) HAMMARLUND HX-500  
by JOHN\_SEHRING.parti@ecunet.org (JOHN SEHRING)
- 18) Diary Note

by BEN NOCK <G4BXD@compuserve.com>  
19) WTB RU-17 cover.  
by jmccarty@lucent.com (John J McCarty)  
20) Re: Diary Note  
by Richard Loken <richardlo@devax.admin.athabascau.ca>  
21) HK 24G  
by brian.harris\_2@philips.com  
22) Re: R1155 Versus RA10DB  
by Andre Guibert <aguibert@sympatico.ca>  
23) Re: Diary Note  
by WF2U <mbendror@villagenet.com>

-----  
Message-Id: <3.0.6.32.20000203131451.0079f430@lib.drury.edu>  
Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2000 13:14:51 -0600  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
From: "Mike O'Brien" <mobrien@lib.drury.edu>  
Subject: Re: PILOT WASP  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Relying on creaky memory here, Al, but I think the Pilot Wasp is a TRF broadcast receiver from the 1920s that is prized among wooden-cabinet collectors...

73, Mike, KOMYW

At 12:45 PM 2/3/00 -0600, Allan Culbert wrote:

>BAers,  
>  
>I have recently come into the possession of an old vintage (circa 1930?)  
>receiver. The only clue as to its lineage is the box containing the plug-in  
>coils for it which has a printed label "Coil set for Pilot Wasp".  
>  
>Can anyone provide some information on this radio and / or where I might  
>find some information including a circuit schematic?  
>  
>Thanks in advance.  
>  
>73  
>  
>Al, K0AL  
>

-----  
Message-ID: <3899D8B4.D640FAF5@erols.com>  
Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2000 14:36:21 -0500  
From: philip mccoey <dgnova@erols.com>

MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
Subject: Re pilot wasp  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

wasp no 1:  
four tubes, 22 rf stage 201a regen detector, 201a audio and 201 or  
112 audio output. batter operated. Front panel should have  
"Pilot super wasp written on it. 2 tuning condensers.

wasp no 2:  
Super wasp AC receiver  
four 5 pin tubes, 24 RF stage, the rest 27s  
There was a ac power pack, don't know if built  
into receiver

If your receiver matches this description, e-mail me and  
I will provide schematic and instructions.

Philip McCoy dgnova@erols.com

-----  
Message-ID: <002501bf6e84\$4d1abe80\$a85a143f@default>  
From: "Paul Bernhard Sr." <w2tu@email.msn.com>  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
Subject: voltages, again (long)  
Date: Thu, 3 Feb 2000 15:21:40 -0500

All: Nominal voltages are just that, nominal. The voltage you read at your receptacle or junction box may vary from the original transformer voltage because of many things. (wire size, line length, load, etc.) All these affect the voltage. (simple ohm's law)

Our numbers come from the quoted rules. 120/240 is common. The wye connection gives us 120/208 and also 277/480. (line voltage = 1.73 X phase voltage).

The high voltage mentioned in the 4 wire example comes from the use of the 3 wire delta at 240 per leg with one of the phases being center tapped to give us 120/240 for residential use. The third leg of the delta will be the "high" leg or "red" leg among other things and will show that higher voltage. This must be identified by an orange or red color according to NEC.

The code uses the nominal voltages as being 110-120, 220-240, etc. Any where in between is possible.

By the way, they call our 120/240 residential connection the "Edison connection". I wonder why? All Tom Edison wanted to do was transmit DC. The very first AC transmission line was right here between Niagara Falls and Buffalo at the turn of the last century, just in time for the Pan American Exposition.

Have fun with this.

Paul B. W2TU

-----  
Message-ID: <3899E3B5.D536B86E@ix.netcom.com>  
Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2000 14:23:17 -0600  
From: David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
Subject: Re: 3 questions  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Gary asked:

> 1. I bought a small lot of tubes from the E place in order to get a 2A3  
>for my BC-610-E project  
>transmitter. The box says 2A3, the tube says 6550. My meager tube manual  
>library says nothing.  
>Are they the same? Or did I goof up?

They are not the same. The 2A3 is a valuable and expensive audio tube. It's possible this was an "honest mistake," but the fact that the 2A3 box had a bogus tube in it is suspect. Check the guy's feedback rating and write a few people from some of his transactions- see if they've had any trouble with him. That should tell you if he's made an honest mistake or is out to snooker you.

I would ask the person who sold the lot to make an adjustment to the selling price. If he refuses, write Safeharbor at theBay and report with all the facts. The vast majority of us who trade there are very glad when any crook gets "the boot."

Kind regards,  
Dave S.

-----  
Date: Thu, 3 Feb 2000 15:32:56 -0500 (EST)  
From: William Donzelli <aw288@osfn.org>  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
cc: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
Subject: Re: 3 questions

Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.91-FP.1000203152841.3849E-1000000@osfn.org>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

> They are not the same. The 2A3 is a valuable and expensive  
> audio tube. It's possible this was an "honest mistake,"  
> but the fact that the 2A3 box had a bogus tube in it is  
> suspect.

If the guy is a crook, subbing 6550s for 2A3s, he's a dumb crook. 6550s are getting very expensive these days, as they have been blessed with the warm sound. In fact, I would venture to say a Tung-Sol or Raytheon 6550 is worth more than a non-RCA 2A3.

Likely its just an honest mistake.

William Donzelli  
aw288@osfn.org

-----  
Message-ID: <389A32CB.A0797732@tir.com>  
Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2000 18:00:43 -0800  
From: sbrovas <sbrovas@tir.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
Subject: FS: 2ea Pair of 4-250A Eimac and RCA Tubes  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

One looks excellent, the other used condition but good appearance. Filaments check ok. Silk screening on both tubes. Price is \$85 shipped stateside.

Second pair of RCA 4-250A looks excellent -, the other used condition but good appearance. Filaments check ok. Silk screening on both tubes. Price shipped is \$75.

73's de Bill, WA1APX/8

-----  
Message-ID: <389A3135.D2C69CA5@tir.com>  
Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2000 17:53:57 -0800  
From: sbrovas <sbrovas@tir.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
Subject: FS: Pair of EIMAC 100TH Tubes  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The Eimacs are from an estate. One looks like new and the other overall exc. Both have full silk screen and no signs of abuse. Also, filaments checked good under load. Tubes are \$100 for pair shipped UPS.  
73's de Bill, WA1APX/8

-----  
Message-ID: <389A33BE.33FE12FA@tir.com>  
Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2000 18:04:46 -0800  
From: sbrovas <sbrovas@tir.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
Subject: FS: Collins and Blackhawk Passband Filters  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Believed to be pass band filters.... For your project. Hereís the specifics:

COLLINS FRQX22YY  
SM-B-527034  
526-7755-001

Second filter  
Blackhawk Networks Corp  
SM-B-527035  
576kcs

\$20 for both shipped stateside.

73's de Bill, WA1APX/8

-----  
Message-ID: <389A17B2.432@worldnet.att.net>  
Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2000 19:05:06 -0500  
From: "John Dilks, K2TQN" <oldradio@worldnet.att.net>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
CC: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
Subject: Re: Re pilot wasp  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Schematics and construction information are on

<http://www.eht.com/oldradio/arrl/>

--  
73' John Dilks, K2TQN

QST Old Radio Column - Support Page  
<http://www.eht.com/oldradio/arrl/>

"Page 2" all about Antique Wireless & Radio History  
<http://www.eht.com/oldradio/awa/>

The New Jersey Antique Radio Club  
<http://www.eht.com/oldradio/>

Please visit my OldRadio Museum  
<http://www.eht.com/oldradio/museum/>

-----  
Message-ID: <389A3E1E.5A1B8E60@hitter.net>  
Date: Thu, 03 Feb 2000 21:49:02 -0500  
From: Walt Petersen <w2jdh@hitter.net>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
Subject: R-390A help!  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I'm interested in an R-390A(?) that's locally available. There's no manual.

I'm uncomfortable with the nameplate (it says R-390A, but has no serial number but it hasn't been altered) and know very little about the R-390A. I am aware that the R-390 is quite similar but less desirable and doesn't have mechanical filters.

Other than the nameplate, how can I tell the difference between the 390 and the A?

Walt, W2JDH

-----  
Message-ID: <012501bf6ebd\$3622fc40\$113bbfd1@MikeBFeher>  
From: "Mike Feher" <n4fs@monmouth.com>  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
Subject: Re: R-390A help!  
Date: Thu, 3 Feb 2000 22:09:07 -0500  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Walt -

>From front panel only it is pretty apparent. The 390A has the nameplate lightly above the readout bezel and above that there is an antenna trim control. The 390 has the nameplate almost to the top edge of the panel, there is only space between it and the bezel and there is no antenna trim control. Also the nameplate on the 390 is narrower but wider than the one on the 390A. Hope that helps. 73 - Mike

Mike B. Feher, N4FS  
89 Arnold, Blvd.  
Howell, NJ, 07731  
732-901-9193

> Other than the nameplate, how can I tell the difference between the 390  
> and the A?  
>  
>  
> Walt, W2JDH  
>  
>

-----  
Message-ID: <013401bf6ebe\$55f93420\$113bbfd1@MikeBFeher>  
From: "Mike Feher" <n4fs@monmouth.com>  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
Subject: Re: R-390A help!  
Date: Thu, 3 Feb 2000 22:17:10 -0500  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Sorry, typo, I meant to say "slightly" and not "lightly". 73 - Mike

Mike B. Feher, N4FS  
89 Arnold, Blvd.  
Howell, NJ, 07731  
732-901-9193

> Other than the nameplate, how can I tell the difference between the 390  
> and the A?  
>  
>



> Walt, W2JDH

>

>

-----  
From: Jderm740@aol.com  
Message-ID: <19.1009f55.25cba458@aol.com>  
Date: Thu, 3 Feb 2000 22:41:12 EST  
Subject: Re: Wasp  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
CC: boatanchors@theporch.com  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Al

I can send you a copy of the Rider write-up. It's a stinker to read, but maybe you can get to a copier that will blow it up for you.

Jack McDermott                      Jderm740@aol.com

-----  
From: "Larry L. Ravlin" <sheepdip@continet.com>  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
Subject: r-390a  
Date: Thu, 3 Feb 2000 21:21:30 -0800  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
Message-ID: <20000204052341796.AAA209@falcon.continet.com@his-highness>

Gentlemen,

I just received a R390A that Chuck Rippel has gone thru. Words fail me. this is such a beautiful work of art that mere words cannot begin to describe it. A big plus is that it works as good as it looks.

Larry L. Ravlin AKA (Laurence the Magnificent)  
"Collins Equipt forever"  
Ham Radio Operator AA7LR ex K4AEY  
Walterville, Or.  
sheepdip@continet.com

"this is not a rice storage facility"

-----  
Message-Id: <3.0.1.32.20000204085647.01e55bf0@vuse.vanderbilt.edu>  
Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2000 08:56:47 -0600  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
From: "A. B. Bonds" <ab@vuse.vanderbilt.edu>  
Subject: Re: R-390A help!  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

At 09:49 PM 2/3/00 -0500, you wrote:

>I'm interested in an R-390A(?) that's locally available. There's no  
>>manual.

>

Manuals are available on-line (pdf files) at the 390 FAQ site.

>I'm uncomfortable with the nameplate (it says R-390A, but has no serial  
>number but it hasn't been altered) and know very little about the  
>R-390A. I am aware that the R-390 is quite similar but less desirable  
>and doesn't have mechanical filters.

Well, that's a matter of judgment. I have one R390 and two 390A's, an early Collins and a later Capehart. All have been done over quite carefully. Of these, which do I listen to? The 390. Sounds better. While the mechanical filters are clearly more precise than the LC filters, they can give an unhappy edge to the sound. They are also much worse in conditions of high atmospheric noise, something like "ringing". As for sensitivity, the comparison is a wash for all practical purposes. The 390 has 2 RF stages, the 390A only one (but of high gain). Sensitivity is not the problem, atmospheric noise is the problem.

>  
>Other than the nameplate, how can I tell the difference between the 390  
>and the A?  
>  
The 390 has the antenna tuning knob on the right and a squelch position on  
the control knob. The 390A has the antenna tuning in the middle and no  
squelch. And the 390 weighs about 15 lbs more.

Either one, you've got a good machine there.

A. B. Bonds

-----  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Date: Fri, 4 Feb 2000 10:21:01 -0500 (EST)  
Subject: FILTER CAPS IN SERIES  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
From: JOHN\_SEHRING.parti@ecunet.org (JOHN SEHRING)  
Message-ID: <200002041021.aa10524@pcusa01.ecunet.org>

Part of my original note:

>The total voltage across the string will be distributed inversely  
according >to the \*actual\* capacitance of each cap. At equilibrium, each  
cap in the >string will have equal charge (by series current & all that).  
Recall that >capacitance is defined as charge per volt ( $C = Q / V$ ), so more  
capacitance >gives greater ability to hold charge, i.e. less voltage across  
the cap for >same amount of charge contained in it.

Part of reply #1:

> We are talking here about DC supplies, so the voltage across a cap in  
> series with another cap will be inversely porportional to the LEAKAGE  
> RESISTANCE, not to the capacitance, at least after everything is charged  
> up. In such circuits, you must always have resistors in parallel with  
> the caps to define the voltage, and the current through the resistors  
> needs to be enough to ge larger than the leakage current for even a  
> tired, moderatly leaky capacitor.

More of my original note:

> > So, the "weaker" (having less than rated capacitance) caps in a series  
> > string will have \*more\* voltage across them. Ironically it is the  
> weaker > caps that will see more stress. ....

Part of reply #2 (from a different person):

> I am having difficulty with your analysis. I can't agree that some caps  
> have lower capacitance and some have more outside of their usual  
> tolerance spread which would be reasonably constant independent of  
> leakage. I think it is more a problem of shunt resistance caused by the  
> leakage behavior of each individual cap. Caps with lower capacitance  
> would of course have a higher ripple voltage but the average DC voltage  
> across each capacitor is set more by the series resistance string which  
> is a combination of the external ballasting resistors and the caps'  
> internal resistances (which goes up as reforming occurs).

I stand by my original statement: The voltage across each filter capacitor in a series string will be inversely proportional to its capacitance. E.g. more capacitance in one cap than another (let's assume 2 caps in series here) will cause *less* voltage to appear across it due to  $C = Q / V$ . That is after all the point of capacitance, that a larger capacitor will hold more charge for a given voltage potential across it.

The argument that the voltage inequality is due to greater internal leakage thru one cap (the cap with the greater voltage across it) is simply wrong.

Just do a simple *DC* circuit analysis to see why. Let's assume we have 1000 V total across the string. We want 500 V across each of the 2 caps in series string. We want 5 mA of bleeder current.

New cap has leakage current of, say, 1 mA, this is equivalent to 500K of leakage resistance (@ 500V). Old cap has leakage current of, say, 5 mA, equiv. to 100K of leakage resistance (again @ 500 V).

First draw a circuit of a 100K bleeder resistor (which will give 5 mA of bleeder current @ 500 V) in parallel with new cap's leakage resistance of 500K. The equiv. resistance of this parallel combo of 100K & 500K is 87.5K.

Then, in series with the above parallel ct., draw a 2nd combo of a 100k bleeder resistance in parallel with old cap's leakage R of 100K. The equiv. resistance of this parallel combo of 100K and 100K is 50K.

The *total* resistance of this series/parallel combo is 137.5K (87.5K + 50K). Elementary analysis will show that 636 V ( $87.5/137.5 \times 1000$  V) appears across the 1st combo (which contains the new cap) and 363 V ( $50/137.5 \times 1000$  V) appears across the 2nd combo (which contains the old cap).

This is exactly *OPPOSITE* what the note writers say should happen! I.e. less voltage appears across the more leaky cap; I measured the opposite. Yes, leakage resistance of a worn out cap is often larger but it is the loss of its capacitance that causes excess voltage to appear across

it in series string service. Any elementary AC electronics textbook covering voltages across series caps will confirm this.

I am certainly open to further ideas on this!

-John Sehring (Thu, Feb 3, 2000, temp. at Richmond VA) UCC WB0EQ

-----  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Date: Fri, 4 Feb 2000 10:21:01 -0500 (EST)  
Subject: HAMMARLUND HX-500  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
From: JOHN\_SEHRING.parti@ecunet.org (JOHN SEHRING)  
Message-ID: <200002041021.aa10530@pcusa01.ecunet.org>

To: boatanchors@theporch.com

The production run of HX-500s must have been tiny. I've seen only a couple in my decades at hamfests.

It's an overly-complicated radio, a step backward. Ironically, the infamous HX-50 (Drifty Fifty) was an earlier design but more modern! It used xtal filter for sideband filtering & had a pi-net output network--who wants to do without the latter?!

The 500 generates SSB at a very low IF freq of 60 kHz & needs to use a horribly complex LC filtering scheme to work. (This harks back to the Halli HT-30 which was not a roaring success.) To switch sidebands, bits of capacitance are switched into \*each\* LC section to move its frequency. Yuck, what a nightmare! If you think the -50 with its bandpass couplers & basic instabilities was hard to align..! The modern & better way is to move the carrier oscillator freq & of course xtal filters.

You'll note there is only a Final Tune control, no Loading control at all. The 500 doesn't even have a fully adjustable pi-net output, necessitating the use of an outboard ATU--that's just stupid IMHO. It's designed to load correctly \*only\* into 50 ohms, ha!

I continue to be amazed at the lack of distinction between something being rare and being operationally poor! Rare can mean it was overpriced to begin with so few sold or manufacturing problems so few delivered or lousy performance so that many were junked!

-John Sehring (Thu, Feb 3, 2000, temp. at Richmond VA) UCC WB0EQ

-----

Does anyone have an RU-17 tube compartment cover that they would not mind parting with ?

Tnx

John n9hrt  
jmccarty@lucent.com

-----  
Date: Fri, 04 Feb 2000 13:06:28 -0700 (MST)  
From: Richard Loken <richardlo@devax.admin.athabascau.ca>  
Subject: Re: Diary Note  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
Cc: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
Message-id:  
<Pine.PMDF.3.95.1000204125652.541065822A-1000000@devax.admin.athabascau.ca>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Ah Ben, if I only had one to operate. I saw one in Nanton's Lancaster a couple years back. Very pretty: lots of coloured knobs. Of the WWII airborne radios that I've seen I like the R1155 and T1154 best because they are so pretty. The BC348 and ART-13 are second and the RA10 and TA12 are a very distant third because they are soooo ugly. All the American command sets have a place in my heart: they are compact, simple, and efficient... but those Bendixes? Nah!

The R1155 is reputed to be a good performer but I have never heard from anybody who has operated an RA-10. Did Bendix build a good radio?

And don't anybody offer me a T1154. I have a fifteen year backlog of fine old boatanchors and a wife who will stop being understanding some day.

---

Richard Loken VE6BSV, Systems Programmer - VMS  
Athabasca University  
Athabasca, Alberta Canada  
\*\* richardlo@admin.athabascau.ca \*\*

-----  
From: brian.harris\_2@philips.com  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
Subject: HK 24G  
Message-ID: <0056910003545786000002L162\*@MHS>  
Date: Fri, 4 Feb 2000 14:13:58 -0600  
MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1; name="MEMO 02/04/00 14:17:01"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable  
Content-Disposition: inline

I have what appears to be a NIB Heintz and Kaufman 24G triode that I'll make available (free) to somebody with a rig that uses them. Rules of War apply.

Brian Harris WA5UEK  
=

-----  
Message-Id: <1.5.4.16.19800104163013.271ffcaa@pop1.sympatico.ca>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
From: Andre Guibert <aguibert@sympatico.ca>  
Subject: Re: R1155 Versus RA10DB  
Date: Fri, 4 Feb 2000 15:38:29 -0500

Bonsoir Richard and All  
The RA10DB is a navigation receiver with some built in backlash, being tuned remotely by speedometer like cables, no dial on receiver.  
The R1155 is more of a communication receiver with a really fine tuning knob combined with a tuning eye.  
Supposed to get a price on a brand new still in box T1154.  
Andre

Andre Guibert  
aguibert@sympatico.ca

-----  
Date: Fri, 4 Feb 2000 15:45:19 -0500 (EST)  
Message-Id: <200002042045.PAA00180@vnet.villagenet.com>  
From: WF2U <mbendror@villagenet.com>  
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
Cc: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
Subject: Re: Diary Note  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

If I could just find the power supply and the manual for my T1154, I could get on the air with the R1155/T1154 and celebrate! Even if I could find only the manual to figure out the feeding habits of the beast, I might have enough time



